UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,339	07/18/2003	Alexander B. Beaman	APL1P283/P3109US1	3294

62464 7590 12/31/2009

BEYER LAW GROUP LLP/APPLE INC.
P.O. BOX 1687
CUPERTINO, CA 95015-1687

EXAMINER	
THERIAULT, STEVEN B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/31/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOmail@beyerlaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/623,339	BEAMAN, ALEXANDER B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEVEN B. THERIAULT	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 October 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *49-72* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *49-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/02/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: RCE filed 10/02/2009.

2. Claims 49-72 are pending in the case. Claims 49, 52, 61, 65, and 67 are the independent claims. Claims 49-72 are new. Claims 1-48 have been cancelled

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/02/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 49-54, 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto et al. (hereinafter Umemoto) U.S. Patent No. 6983251 filed Feb. 15, 2000, in view of Hiipakka et al . (hereinafter Hiipakka) U.S. Patent Pub No. 2003/0098892 filed Nov. 29, 2001, in further view of Forest et al. (hereinafter Forest) U.S. Patent No. 5999895 filed July 24, 1995.**

In regard to **Independent claim 49,** Umemoto teaches a method for providing an audible menu, comprising:

- Presenting a navigable menu on a graphical user interface (GUI) that includes navigation menu icons presented on a visual display (See first, second, sixth and eighth embodiment). and Figure 2, where the display includes icons activated by inputs to the controller 4, 5,6.
- Receiving user input indicating movement to a particular navigation menu icon (See column 9, lines 1-15).
- Receiving user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon (See column 9, lines 14-35)
- Executing a specific navigation corresponding to the particular navigation menu icon in response to the receiving of the user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon, wherein the specific navigation command does not include playing a media item (See column 9, lines 15-67).

Umemoto does not expressly recite:

- receiving customization settings from a user, wherein the customization settings include an indication of a type of media file to navigate;

- Outputting an audible output corresponding to the particular navigation menu icon, wherein the audible output is customized based upon the customization settings

However, Hiipakka teaches a system that allows the user to customize not only the positional amplitude of audio to aid in the navigation of the menu (see Para 29) but also teaches a customization interface that allows the user to specify the presentment of the auditory icons (See Para 48). Hiipakka teaches the user can specify the how, when and in what format the icons are presented. Hiipakka teaches the use of a user profile to vary the customization of the auditory icons and the icons can be presented in a variety of ways, which would include the audio output of the icon (See Para 49-50). Hiipakka and Umemoto are analogous art as they both provide teachings to display icons to the user to select via audible means. They also both provide menus for CD and media players. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify Umemoto to include the customization of the displayed icon audio output. The motivation to combine Hiipakka with Umemoto comes from within Hiipakka to provide information via audio and visual icons to the user with customized display characteristics (See Para 6-7). Umemoto in view of Hiipakka does not teach a menu selection mechanism with a timer.

Umemoto in view of Hiipakka does not expressly recite:

- wherein the outputting only occurs after a predetermined amount of time has elapsed without receipt of user input indicating movement to a different navigation menu icon and without receipt of user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon;

However, Forest expressly teaches a process of providing a menu selection feature where the cursor can dwell on a menu option and after a period of time has expired the menu selection will occur (See column 9, lines 10-46, column 43 lines 20-67, column 44, lines 1-67 and column 26, lines 1-55). Forest expressly teaches a menu selection mechanism to help disabled individuals select menu options and by providing a dwell feature the interface selections made by the user that has a muscle spasm or a difficulty in keeping their hands steady can make selections by

moving the mouse to the input and then leaving it there. Once time expires then the menu is selected. Forest expressly teaches a two step selection process that will first accept the user' s selection of the menu and then wait a period of time (e.g. dwell) for another input to indicate the user wants to effect the given menu option (See column 9, lines 1-67, column 10, lines 55-67, column 11, lines 1-30, column 27, lines 1-67, column 43, lines 20-30 , column 44, lines 40-55 and column 47, lines 1-67. Forest, Umemoto and Hiipakka all teach menu options are selectable and read aloud to the user and they all provide input mechanisms that help the user to make selections on the device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Hiipakka systems to allow dwell time inputs to the media device to assist in selection functions. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto comes from the suggestion in Forest to allow individuals with muscular disorders or a wide variety of medical issues to select menu options (See column 3, lines 45-67) for the purposes of controlling the device, access applications that were previously inaccessible, enhancing self esteem and expanding personal interaction (See column 3).

With regard to **dependent claim 50,** Umemoto teaches method wherein the type of media file to navigate is selected from the group consisting of song files, audio book files, podcast files, image files, and video files (See figure 6a – 6c and column 9, lines 55-67).

With regard to **dependent claim 51,** Umemoto teaches the method wherein the customized audible output corresponding to the particular navigation menu icon when a song file is the indicated type of media file to navigate is a different audible output than would be output for the particular navigation menu icon when a video file is the indicated type of media file to navigate (See column 13, lines 40-67).

In regard to **Independent claim 52,** Umemoto teaches a client device lacking a display (see for example embodiments one and three and column 3, lines 5-10), the client device comprising: a processor; and a memory configured to store a plurality of media items operably connected with the processor;

- Wherein the processor is operable to assist a user in selecting at least one of the plurality of stored media items by (see figure 7 and e.g. embodiment one and three):
- Playing a media file from the media database (See column 10, lines 1-20)
- Providing a navigable hierarchical menu, wherein the hierarchical menu includes a hierarchical level including only navigation items, the navigation items corresponding to drill-down or drill-up commands to different levels of the hierarchical menu (See figure 4).
- Executing a navigation command corresponding to the selected first of the navigation items (See figure 4, item 33 and 36). .

Umemoto does not expressly recite:

- Lacking a display

Umemoto suggests that the audio output can be done without a display of visual icons (See column 3, lines 5-10). Umemoto does not recite a display for embodiments 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7) However Umemoto is silent as to not needing a display.

However, Hiipakka teaches a system expressly states a display is not needed (See Para 25). . Hiipakka and Umemoto are analogous art as they both provide teachings to display icons to the user to select via audible means. They also both provide menus for CD and media players. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify Umemoto to include the presentation of audio information without the user viewing the display. The motivation to combine Hiipakka with Umemoto comes from within Hiipakka to provide information via audio and visual icons to the user with customized display characteristics (See Para 6-7). Umemoto in view of Hiipakka does not teach a menu selection mechanism with a timer.

Umemoto in view of Hiipakka does not expressly recite:

- wherein the outputting only occurs after a predetermined amount of time has elapsed without receipt of user input indicating movement to a different navigation menu icon and without receipt of user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon;

However, Forest expressly teaches a process of providing a menu selection feature where the cursor can dwell on a menu option and after a period of time has expired the menu selection will occur (See column 9, lines 10-46, column 43 lines 20-67, column 44, lines 1-67 and column 26, lines 1-55). Forest expressly teaches a menu selection mechanism to help disabled individuals select menu options and by providing a dwell feature the interface selections made by the user that has a muscle spasm or a difficulty in keeping their hands steady can make selections by moving the mouse to the input and then leaving it there. Once time expires then the menu is selected. Forest expressly teaches a two step selection process that will first accept the user' s selection of the menu and then wait a period of time (e.g. dwell) for another input to indicate the user wants to effect the given menu option (See column 9, lines 1-67, column 10, lines 55-67, column 11, lines 1-30, column 27, lines 1-67, column 43, lines 20-30 , column 44, lines 40-55 and column 47, lines 1-67. Forest, Umemoto and Hiipakka all teach menu options are selectable and read aloud to the user and they all provide input mechanisms that help the user to make selections on the device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Hiipakka systems to allow dwell time inputs to the media device to assist in selection functions. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto comes from the suggestion in Forest to allow individuals with muscular disorders or a wide variety of medical issues to select menu options (See column 3, lines 45-67) for the purposes of controlling the device, access applications that were previously inaccessible, enhancing self esteem and expanding personal interaction (See column 3).

With respect to **dependent claim 53,** Umemoto teaches the client device wherein the hierarchical menu includes another hierarchical level including one or more media items (See Figures 5a-5a, 6-6c and 7).

With respect to **dependent claim 54,** Umemoto teaches the client device wherein the processor is further operable to:

receive user input selecting a particular one of the stored plurality of media items, the selection not associated with one of the navigation items; and play the particular one of the stored plurality of media items in response to the receipt of the selection (See figure 4, step 33 and 36).

With respect to **claims 61-64,** claims 61-64 represent substantially similar subject matter as claim 49 and is rejected along the same rationale with the main difference in the claims as recited is the user cannot view the display. The teachings of Umemoto, Forest and Hiipakka teaches all of the limitations of claim 49 and in further view of the following claims 61-64 are rejected along the same rationale. Hiipakka teaches the user may not able to view the display to make selections and teaches the display is not needed to allow the user to select auditory icons (See Para 25). Hiipakka teaches the user may be driving a vehicle and cannot look at the device (See Para 0006, for claim 64) or the user is impaired (claim 63). Umemoto teaches playing one of the media items that is not associated with the navigation icon (See Figure 4, step 33 and 36). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify Umemoto to include the customization of the displayed icon audio output. The motivation to combine Hiipakka with Umemoto comes from within Hiipakka to provide information via audio and visual icons to the user with customized display characteristics (See Para 6-7). Further, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Hiipakka systems to allow dwell time inputs to the media device to assist in

selection functions. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto comes from the suggestion in Forest to allow individuals with muscular disorders or a wide variety of medical issues to select menu options (See column 3, lines 45-67) for the purposes of controlling the device, access applications that were previously inaccessible, enhancing self esteem and expanding personal interaction (See column 3).

Claims 55-60, 67-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto et al. (hereinafter Umemoto) U.S. Patent No. 6983251 filed Feb. 15, 2000, in view of Hiipakka et al . (hereinafter Hiipakka) U.S. Patent Pub No. 2003/0098892 filed Nov. 29, 2001, in further view of Forest et al. (hereinafter Forest) U.S. Patent No. 5999895 filed July 24, 1995, in further view of Janik et al. (hereinafter Janik) U.S. Patent Pub No. 20020013852 field Apr. 24, 2001.

With respect to **dependent claim 55-60,** as indicated in the above discussion Umemoto in view of Hiipakka in further view of Forest teach every element of claim 52.
Umemoto teaches a media management system and a database for file and records relating the to files (See Figures 5a-5c and 6a-6c and **7**).
Umemoto in view of Hiipakka in further view of Forest do not expressly teach the client device further comprising:

- media records that include metadata relating to the media files; a voiced names database that stores audio files
- Association records that associate the audio files with data from the media collection records and metadata from the media records.
- Wherein the media file is played through a left channel while the audible output corresponding to the first of the navigation items is played through a fight channel.

- wherein the media file is merged with the audible output corresponding to the first of the navigation items so that both can be played through a single channel simultaneously.
- Providing a text string that represents the first of the navigation items; generating the audio file from the text string; and delivering the audio file to the client device.
- delivering the audio file to the client device occurs when media files are synchronized between the client device and the host device and wherein the delivering the audio file to the client device occurs independently of media files being synchronized between the client device and the host device.

However, teaches a system that allows for access to media content stored on a hand held device that stores media files and provides for access to the media files (See Para 86-106, 117). Janik expressly teaches the operation of displaying streaming media in a media player with playlists, similar to Umemoto and Hiipakka (See Janik Para 132-141). Janik teaches the media files are stored with metadata (See Para 170). Janik teaches associating the records with the media collection (See Para 154). Janik teaches playing the audio output via channels (See Para 118 and figure 19, right and left channels). Janik teaches providing a text string to describe the menu items (See Para 32 and 142). Janik teaches synchronizing the device with the menus (See Para 151).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka, Umemoto and Janik in front of them to modify the Umemoto, Hiipakka and Forest systems to allow media records to be described in playlists using metadata and to synchronize the playlists. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka, Umemoto and Janik comes from the suggestion in Janik to allow individuals to customize content to be delivered to inexpensive client devices (See Para 26) where the menus are audio and based on MP3 based devices (See Para 19-21).

In regard to **claims 67-72,** claims 67-72 represent substantially similar subject matter as claims 52, and 55-60 and are rejected along the same rationale with the main difference in the claims as recited is the menus are provided as text strings. The teachings of Umemoto, Forest and Hiipakka teaches all of the limitations of claim 52, 55-60 and in further view of the following claims 67-72 are rejected along the same rationale. Hiipakka teaches the user may not able to view the display to make selections and teaches the display is not needed to allow the user to select auditory icons (See Para 25). Hiipakka teaches the user may be driving a vehicle and cannot look at the device (See Para 0006, for claim 64) or the user is impaired (claim 63). Umemoto teaches playing one of the media items that is not associated with the navigation icon (See Figure 4, step 33 and 36). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify Umemoto to include the customization of the displayed icon audio output. The motivation to combine Hiipakka with Umemoto comes from within Hiipakka to provide information via audio and visual icons to the user with customized display characteristics (See Para 6-7). Further, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Hiipakka systems to allow dwell time inputs to the media device to assist in selection functions. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka and Umemoto comes from the suggestion in Forest to allow individuals with muscular disorders or a wide variety of medical issues to select menu options (See column 3, lines 45-67) for the purposes of controlling the device, access applications that were previously inaccessible, enhancing self esteem and expanding personal interaction (See column 3). Neither Forest, Umemoto nor Hiipakka teach providing a text string that represents the vocalization, however Janik teaches using a text string (See Para 132) that is independent of the navigation menu.

Janik teaches the user decides to synchronize the device which is a permission request. Janik shows the user can set a time period to receive content and store the time in the metadata file. Janik teaches the user can edit their playlist, which edits the text strings in the file (See Para 132-142). Janik teaches the user can set a time clock for content (see Para 143-150). Janik teaches the content in metadata stores a time and date (See Para 170). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest, Hiipakka, Umemoto and Janik in front of them to modify the Umemoto, Hiipakka and Forest systems to allow media records to be described in playlists using metadata and to synchronize the playlists. The motivation to combine Forest, Hiipakka, Umemoto and Janik comes from the suggestion in Janik to allow individuals to customize content to be delivered to inexpensive client devices (See Para 26) where the menus are audio and based on MP3 based devices (See Para 19-21).

Claims 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto et al. (hereinafter Umemoto) U.S. Patent No. 6983251 filed Feb. 15, 2000, in view of Forest et al. (hereinafter Forest) U.S. Patent No. 5999895 filed July 24, 1995, in further view of LaChapelle et al. (hereinafter LaChapelle) U.S. Patent No. 7054888 field Oct. 17, 2002.

In regard to **Independent claim 65-66,** Umemoto teaches a method for providing an audible menu, comprising:

- presenting a navigable menu on a graphical user interface (GUI) that includes navigation menu icons presented on a visual display (See figure 4).
- receiving user input indicating movement to a particular navigation menu icon (See Figure 3)
- Executing a specific navigation corresponding to the particular navigation menu icon in response to the receiving of the user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon, wherein the specific navigation command does not include playing a media

item (See figure 4, navigation around the loop verses selection.

Umemoto does not expressly teach

- wherein the outputting only occurs after a predetermined amount of time has elapsed without receipt of user input indicating movement to a different navigation menu icon and without receipt of user input indicating selection of the particular navigation menu icon;

However, Forest expressly teaches a process of providing a menu selection feature where the cursor can dwell on a menu option and after a period of time has expired the menu selection will occur (See column 9, lines 10-46, column 43 lines 20-67, column 44, lines 1-67 and column 26, lines 1-55). Forest expressly teaches a menu selection mechanism to help disabled individuals select menu options and by providing a dwell feature the interface selections made by the user that has a muscle spasm or a difficulty in keeping their hands steady can make selections by moving the mouse to the input and then leaving it there. Once time expires then the menu is selected. Forest expressly teaches a two step selection process that will first accept the user' s selection of the menu and then wait a period of time (e.g. dwell) for another input to indicate the user wants to effect the given menu option (See column 9, lines 1-67, column 10, lines 55-67, column 11, lines 1-30, column 27, lines 1-67, column 43, lines 20-30 , column 44, lines 40-55 and column 47, lines 1-67. Forest and Umemoto teach menu options are selectable and read aloud to the user and they all provide input mechanisms that help the user to make selections on the device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Hiipakka systems to allow dwell time inputs to the media device to assist in selection functions. The motivation to combine Forest and Umemoto comes from the suggestion in Forest to allow individuals with muscular disorders or a wide variety of medical issues to select menu options (See column 3, lines 45-67) for the purposes of controlling the device, access applications that

were previously inaccessible, enhancing self esteem and expanding personal interaction (See column 3).

Umemoto in view of Forest does not expressly teach:

- receiving customization settings from a user, wherein the customization settings include an indication of a preferred language and particular navigation menu icon when a first language is indicated as the preferred language is a different audible output than would be output for the particular navigation menu icon when a second language is indicated as the preferred language

However, LaChapelle teaches system that provides a customization setting via metadata entries that sets the natural language preference for the media device play lists (See Figure 2 and 7-8). LaChapelle teaches all of the text stored in the media files sent to the device are stored in Unicode that tells the device a location and language setting for the device (See Appendix A and column 15, lines 55-67). LaChapelle teaches modifying the text strings of the playlist that includes natural language settings which would provide a different audible for the menus based on the language setting. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention having the teachings of Forest and Umemoto in front of them to modify the Umemoto and Forest systems to for natural language settings for the menus. The motivation to combine Forest and Umemoto with LaChapelle comes from the suggestion in LaChapelle to provide metadata playlists to a media player with audio only menus (See column 11, lines 18-21 and) using metadata (See column 10, lines 50-67) that contains a language setting (See also Appendix A).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments to claims 49-72 are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEVEN B. THERIAULT whose telephone number is (571)272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 10 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2179